



Water Conservation and Recycling Roundtable

April 8, 2010, 1 PM to 5 PM

Doubletree Hotel, 2001 Point Way, Sacramento, CA

MEETING SUMMARY

Table of Contents

1. Welcoming Remarks.....	1
2. Purpose of the Roundtable and Its Relationship to the Federal Action Plan.....	2
3. Congressional Statement.....	2
4. Potential Collaborative Ideas for Water Conservation and Recycling.....	2
5. Panel on Water Conservation and Recycling Needs	2
6. Concurrent Breakout Sessions: Opportunities for Water Conservation and Recycling.....	4
5. Closing Remarks from Agency Executives.....	7
6. Adjournment.....	12
7. Attendance	12

Main Roundtable Website: <http://www.usbr.gov/mp/pa/h2ogoals>

1. Welcoming Remarks

Pablo Arroyave, Deputy Regional Director for the U.S Bureau of Reclamation's (USBR) Mid-Pacific Region, opened the meeting by welcoming participants and thanking them for their time. Pablo reviewed the Roundtable goals and scope, as well as noted the attendance of executives and staff from several federal and state agencies, and thanked them for their sponsorship (this included the USBR, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well as the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Department of Public Health (CDPH), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and the California State Board of Food and Agriculture. Pablo emphasized that the Roundtable aimed primarily to provide a venue for stakeholders to share their concerns and suggestions with the agencies. Meeting facilitator Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSU Sacramento, then briefly reviewed the day's agenda, note-taking methods, and ground rules for discussion.

2. Purpose of the Roundtable and Its Relationship to the Federal Action Plan

David Nawi, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of the Interior for California and Nevada, explained that federal and state agencies shared a focus on restoring the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta's ecosystem and ensuring a reliable water supply. David noted that the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan will provide a long-term strategy for meeting these goals, but that an immediate need for action also exists. Accordingly, David noted that six federal agencies signed a memorandum of understanding in September 2009, issued the Interim Federal Action Plan (IFAP) in December, and seek to partner with the State of California. David briefly reviewed the IFAP major components (e.g., coordinated science, water transfers, drought relief); the full document can be downloaded here <http://www.doi.gov/documents/CAWaterWorkPlan.pdf>. In the near term, water conservation and recycling are the primary focus because they can provide tangible actions in the short-term. The Roundtable demonstrates agency leadership and their intent to share and receive useful information and move forward together with stakeholders.

3. Congressional Statement

Kathy Huffman, Senior Field Representative for Congressman George Miller, read a prepared statement from the Congressman. The participants' binder contained a copy of the statement, which can also be downloaded from the main Roundtable website.

4. Potential Collaborative Ideas for Water Conservation and Recycling

Luana Kiger, Special Assistant to the State Conservationist, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, welcomed participants and introduced several of the agency executives in the audience. Luana then provided a presentation that highlighted the initial areas for inter-agency collaboration identified by agency team leaders. The participants' binder contained a copy of the presentation, which can also be downloaded from the main Roundtable website. Main areas for collaboration included (1) leveraging and linking funding opportunities, (2) creating a web-based clearinghouse and database for available programs and assistance, (3) streamlining application processes, (4) developing quarterly programmatic coordination meetings, and (5) supporting the California Senate Bill x7-7's aim to reduce urban water consumption 20% by the year 2020. Luana also noted that the binder contained a table that showed the authorities, main agency programs, and the methods and websites for each of these.

5. Panel on Water Conservation and Recycling Needs

Next, a series of five esteemed panelists shared stories about what their organizations have accomplished, what made their work succeed, what lessons they learned, and their thoughts on how agencies could further support such efforts. Their presentations can be downloaded from the main Roundtable website, along with a detailed transcript. Panelists included:

1. Marvin Meyers, Chairman, Meyers Farms Family Trust (representing agricultural water users)
2. Chris Brown, Executive Director, California Urban Water Conservation Council (representing municipal and industrial water users)
3. Eric Rosenblum, Division Manager, South Bay Water Recycling, Water Resources Group, Environmental Services Department, City of San Jose (representing Title XVI of Public Law 102-575, the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act of 1992)
4. Martha Davis, Executive Manager for Policy Development, Inland Empire Utilities Agency (representing regional conservation and recycling)
5. Juliet Christian-Smith, Senior Research Associate, Pacific Institute (representing non-profits)

The facilitator noted a few challenges and several lessons mentioned in the presentations, including:

Challenges

1. Meeting the required cost-share of funding programs
2. The prolonged return on investment for recycled water efforts
3. The mismatch between short-term capital needs and long-term funding disbursement

Lessons

1. The value of partnerships (e.g., public-private, financial-technical, federal-state-regional)
2. The importance of creativity and flexibility (for example, cash for grass programs, joint funding requests, sharing authorizations, linking agency money and farming labor)
3. The need to think about customers/end users during planning
4. The need to have demonstrable benefits
5. The benefit of having politically visible support
6. The need for efforts to fit and benefit communities, including educating and familiarizing them (e.g., youth involvement, community gardens)
7. The importance of integrated planning (e.g., water quality, environmental, recreational, and climate change – alongside water supply reliability), and result of integrated benefits
8. The ability to increase resiliency and improve systemic flexibility
9. The need to obtain an accurate picture of current uses, which then can be linked to setting targets, monitoring, and developing incentives
10. The existence and high potential of existing technologies

Participants then had time to ask two questions of panelists.

1. Looking at the array of practices that fall under the umbrella of “water conservation and recycling” in California, have the federal agencies made a similar paradigm shift?
 - a. *Martha Davis* replied that traditional infrastructure has limited potential, and emphasized the need to focus on pragmatic actions over the next 40-60 months, and to develop targets and implement programs during this time.
 - b. *Eric Rosenblum* replied that existing institutional arrangements are focused on particular environmental issues, and lack integration. This leads to disconnects,

for example, the energy value tied up in water systems goes unrecognized. Eric emphasized the importance of pushing for programs that have multiple benefits, and pulling institutions into these efforts accordingly.

- c. *Marvin Meyers* replied that Proposition 13 funding was available, but it was hard to navigate the regulatory requirements and he did not ultimately pursue this. He emphasized that his work involved a genuine partnership between his farm and the Bureau of Reclamation, and genuine assistance with developing the ideas and plans. This equal relationship was critical to success.
2. Given that partnerships take time to develop, what can the Bureau of Reclamation do with existing regulations to advance partnerships?
 - a. *Eric Rosenblum* replied that the Bureau announced \$125 million in funding, and got \$600 million of proposed projects. He suggested that the Bureau could expedite these projects based on their qualifications, without seeking individual project authorizations. Or the Bureau could increase its authorizations.

6. Concurrent Breakout Sessions: Opportunities for Water Conservation and Recycling

Following a short break, non-agency participants self-divided into three groups: agricultural water conservation, urban water conservation, and recycled water. Each group was asked to address two questions:

1. *In your experience, what makes conservation/recycling efforts easiest to implement?*
2. *What could the agencies here today do to further support conservation/recycling efforts?*

Participants were allowed to suggest things that would require alterations to existing agency authorities, and things that involved just one agency (rather than multiple agencies). After 45 minutes, the groups reconvened to share their thoughts with each other and the agency representatives. Their summary reports to the full group follow.

Agricultural Water Conservation

- Regarding policies
 - Agencies should minimize contradictions and conflicts between conservation and recycling policies and other policies
 - For example, if a district is subject to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing for dams, they will be slow to implement water conservation programs until their position in that process is clear
 - For example, State and/or Federal agencies could assume liability for the Imperial Irrigation District Quantification Settlement Agreement, and this would help it move forward immediately
 - NEPA and CEQA processes should be combined with regard to conservation policies, just as other permitting should be coordinated
 - Agencies should provide those who supply conserved water with credit, rather than leaving the water behind a dam to be used elsewhere

- Early adopters should not be penalized by losing the water they conserve
 - Funding for the NRCS EQIP program should be increased, along with funding for water management planning assistance at the district level
 - Agencies should identify their priorities, and promote multiple benefits in their awarding of funds
- Regarding technology
 - Agencies should encourage and/or reinstate efforts to research and promote technologies, such as (1) DWR mobile labs, (2) soil monitoring and irrigation, (3) water conservation standards, and (4) good on-farm measurements
 - “Older” districts should be helped to adopt current technologies and standards for increasing water conservation
 - Better integration is needed between groundwater management plans and well use data
 - The efficiency of environmental flows should be evaluated
- Regarding programs
 - Agency programs should do more than just target Best Management Practices, and should clarify their intended effects
 - Agencies should differentiate between recoverable and irrecoverable losses, including those that support groundwater recharge
 - USBR should publish water conservation plans online so other interested parties can learn from other examples
 - Agencies should focus resources on improving baseline monitoring information, including distinguishing between recoverable and irrecoverable flows
- In general
 - It is challenging to obtain a loan given unpredictable water supplies
 - It remains unclear whether those who conserve water will lose their water rights
 - Better public land management could increase water supplies substantially

Urban Water Conservation

- Regarding education
 - Better outreach is needed at the statewide level – why are people being asked to conserve, what benefits does it bring (jobs, recreation, environment) – and these messages tied to action (e.g., tax incentives, rebates)
 - Urban water users are disconnected compared with agricultural users
 - People need to be informed about the easy things they can do to conserve water, and about the multiple benefits of their actions (e.g., better landscaping saves water at the same time as decreasing runoff and increasing water quality)
 - The 20x2020 effort lends itself to statewide messaging
 - Water conservation and water use efficiency should be treated more like energy efficiency, for example, emphasizing things like mandatory efficiency standards
 - Current State and Federal administrations are engaging in rulemaking and the adoption of new standards
 - Mandatory efficiency standards are easiest to implement and have the broadest effect
 - Agencies should minimize the administration required for grant funds – smaller grants are not worth the effort

- Regarding rebates
 - If rebates are offered, loops should be closed and unintended consequences avoided – for examples, used washers should not be allowed to be resold
 - Agencies should offer tax rebates for water use efficiency measures, and these should be linked to and used to strengthen the impact of education efforts
- Regarding federal programs
 - Federal jobs programs do not fund water conservation projects very effectively, and are not optimized to provide water benefits
 - Stormwater and rainwater capture should be considered conservation
 - Federal programs should recognize regional planning efforts
- Regarding the scope of “water conservation” and “water recycling”
 - Agencies should work to consolidate programs – to create fewer programs, yet programs that are broader in scope
 - Programs should engage users at the most effective levels – for example, focus on an irrigation district if it can leverage funds better than an individual, or focus on a regional rather than agency level
 - Agencies should make a united push to encourage urban conservation in the outdoor water use sector, when a lot of potential remains
 - Agencies should create large-scale programs where every urban water agency can participate
 - Discussion is needed of how conserved water can be used for the environment

Recycled Water

- Regarding ease of implementation
 - Agency coordination increases implementation – regulatory agencies should agree on the reasons for doing conservation, and coordinate the messages they communicate to the public, particularly schools
 - This should include quantifying economic benefits of water savings
 - This should include creating incentives for cities and purveyors to work with recycled water producers
 - Agencies should seek the support of environmental groups by clarifying underlying motives for conservation, and avoid fights based on “no growth” positions
 - Year-round demands from recycled water consumers help avoid the need for seasonal storage
 - Agencies should create economic incentives for people to use recycled water as potable water
 - Agencies should identify good groundwater basins for recharge, and identify large quantity recycled water users
 - Trust between customers and agencies is critical to this – public perception about the safety of recycled water and its use, at both the conceptual and project level
- Regarding agency actions
 - California needs a united message about the need for recycled water – yet currently it is regulated as a waste while simultaneously promoted as a resource

- This may require redefining recycled water as a resource, which would allow it avoid Non-Point Source Discharge rules (also a source of conflict for environmental and recycled water advocates)
- Agencies should streamline the customer use sites, and connect with county health departments
- The California Department of Public Health and county agencies should streamline the approval process for non-potable reuse
- Agencies should give credit for recycled water use, and develop regulations for advance treatment so that the effectiveness of this treatment is recognized
- Agencies should provide funding for on-site improvements (e.g., customer connections and retrofits) as well as pipeline extensions
- Agencies should fund (seasonable) storage for recycled water, which increases reliability
 - The City of Santa Rosa was given permission to use 100% of their recycled water because they have the means to store it during the winter and use it in the summer
- Agencies should fund potable reuse projects that demonstrate the possibility of balancing the reuse of storm water with flood protection requirements
- Agencies should develop an inter-district recycling program so that water can be available for use by others
- SWRCB should advocate more for recycled water as part of the California Water Plan
- Federal agencies should designate an ombudsman to help walk applicants thorough overly complex processes
 - USBR should have the discretion to fund Title XVI projects based on competitive value – this would eliminate the need to go through authorization
 - USBR should reinstate programs with a greater than \$20 million federal share so that local agencies can supply projects as the need comes up without having to get re-authorization
 - USEPA, USBR, and USDA should together better highlight the benefit of recycled water to the Obama Administration and Congress
 - USBR should support Title XVI with a one billion dollar line item in its budget – hence avoiding earmarks or taking money out of already cash-strapped programs
 - USBR should fund these projects directly without additional authorization

5. Closing Remarks from Agency Executives

In light of the day's discussions, executives from each agency remarked on conversation highlights and possible next steps.

1. **Dave White, Chief, NRCS, USDA**, commented on the importance of California agriculture to the United States, and the need to increase food production without degrading environmental resources. He suggested that future efforts must emphasize collaboration, rather than single agency solutions. Like panelist Martha Davis, he

emphasized the urgency of these efforts and focusing on what can be done in 40-60 months. He emphasized that California can lead the way for the nation in demonstrating how complex water challenges can be addressed in integrative ways that produce multiple benefits.

2. **Michael Connor, Commissioner, USBR, Department of the Interior**, commented that the assembled resources and expertise can help move California beyond the status quo. He noted that the day's discussions would help educate members of Congress, and create on-the-ground benefits. Commissioner Connor noted that the agencies would take the day's information and figure out what they can do with their existing authorities, and develop demonstration projects that have visible benefits. He noted the importance of working to integrate agricultural, municipal, and environmental programs, and eventually scaling up demonstration projects to serve the entire state. Commissioner Connor suggested that the Federal and State agencies would continue to caucus (including stakeholders as possible), develop a draft plan and strategy, and take this back out to stakeholders and the public for comment this summer. He noted several examples from the day's discussion of existing and potential programs that would advance the Action Plan, particularly the Meyers Farm Family Trust program. He emphasized the importance of linking federal and state agency efforts, and pooling their resources on a larger scale.
3. **Mark Cowin, Director, DWR**, introduced Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Deputy Director for Integrated Water Management, who will make administrative decisions over many of the topics discussed. He emphasized the importance of comprehensive, integrated solutions – what the California Secretary for Natural Resources Lester Snow calls “total resource management.” Director Cowin noted that this philosophy is already reflected in the California Water Plan Update 2009, which highlights the fundamental importance of water use efficiency. He noted that a theme he heard throughout the day concerned the Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWMPs), which involve DWR and SWRCB. The program promotes regional management and had broken down barriers; approximately \$1 billion of funding remains from Proposition 84, and if the November bond passes it could provide another \$1 billion for this work (along with \$500 million for drought, \$1 billion for water conservation, and \$250 million for water use efficiency). Director Cowin noted that local agencies had prioritized their work on a regional basis through the IRWMP planning process. He suggested that State and Federal agencies should work together on this program to define the standards for an acceptable plan and what a plan should consider, and then collaborate to provide a greater and more flexible range of funding.
4. **Pete Silva, Assistant Administrator for Water, USEPA**, commented that his agency's work focused primarily on helping local utilities and communities in urban areas. He noted the WaterSense program (which provides building specifications to the housing industry) has grown exponentially since being unveiled last December. Administrator Silva explained that the EPA is involved in permitting and can use this indirectly to promote water supply reliability, for example, through green

infrastructure (most recently through state revolving funds), energy and water conservation, and stormwater permits, among other things. He flagged the importance of considering the numerous connections and benefits from something like stormwater management, which can reduce runoff, save power and money for a utility, and benefit customers, all while increasing supplies. He suggested that WaterSense might usefully be expanded for industries. He agreed that federal agencies should work together to maximize their funding, and work with communities to make sure the benefits are also maximized. Lastly, he noted that the USEPA was working with the SWRCB to improve the monitoring of stressors on the Delta.

5. **Fran Spivy-Weber, Chair, SWRCB**, supported the emphasis on immediate actions that can be taken in the next 40-60 months. She also noted the federal offer to host regular interagency gatherings to discuss funding offers, including State agencies but also potentially regional agencies with special districts and others that have funding that can be leveraged as part of the larger effort. Chair Spivy-Weber also emphasized the importance of starting with a clear goal, rather than just focusing on funding. Like Director Cowin, she noted the value and importance of the IRWMP program, which has the potential to link conservation and recycling efforts to larger integrated regional efforts. She noted that all recycled and urban water conservation programs should have a home in IRWMPs. She also suggested that while these programs are being brought into IRWMPs, agencies should simultaneously pick low-hanging fruit immediately, things like landscape/turf replacement and leak reduction. Looking further ahead, she underscored the importance of cost-effective data collection and monitoring, involving USBR and DWR but also NASA satellites, and noted that a robust statewide system is slowly become available and publicly accessible. Lastly, she emphasized the importance of the water-energy nexus, noting that the California Energy Commission and California Public Utilities Commission also have a role to play in this dialogue. She noted that the EPA already has energy audits, and suggested that the State do additional audits to identify water savings, and look to partner with some of the same institutions that fund energy conservation.
6. **Al Montna, President, California State Board of Food and Agriculture**, emphasized the importance of having a new venue for Federal and State agencies to collaborate. He noted the enormous potential of California agriculture, but the problems created by not being able to store or move water. For example, it is difficult to pay a loan on water use efficient systems because land can't be farmed. He supported the idea of having an ombudsman, a "one-stop-shop", for conservation and recycling efforts, given how many agencies are involved in even minor alterations of streambeds. He also noted the willingness of agricultural organizations and growers to participate in finding solutions.

Participants then asked several questions of the executives.

1. If one recycles water and uses it appropriately, is it still wastewater? If this cannot be settled, it will undermine integrated water and wastewater management efforts.

- a. *Chair Spivy-Weber*: We can go forward with IRWM and recycled water without this information, although it is important to address. There are several words like this (e.g., waivers), and I promise that the SWRCB will work with USEPA on that.
2. The meaning of “IRWM” is not well communicated. A workshop would help for this – what does the term mean, how are these programs set up? The way State and Federal funding is set up does not support integrated management, with the exception of Proposition 84.
 - a. *Assistant Administrator Silva*: Congress has asked USEPA to look at the definition of “sustainable” in relation to funding requirements, and we are working on this task. The idea of a conference in California or throughout the country would help to define that term.
 - b. *Director Cowin*: I agree with the need to coordinate funding to provide greater flexibility. To the extent that we can use Proposition 84 to bridge the gaps between topic-specific funding sources, we get more efficient solutions.
3. How do you plan to reoperate State and Federal facilities that do not only serve regions, but serve water contractors? How do you reoperate them to serve broader purposes while still meeting the needs of consumers?
 - a. *Director Cowin*: This would achieve more supply reliability, but the drought makes this difficult. Regardless, to the extent that the system can be improved and water can be stored when available, there is room for improving the synchrony between Federal, State, regional, and local projects.
 - b. *Commissioner Connor*: As we build more flexibility into our management systems we will accrue a larger set of long-term benefits and values. Creative solutions exist.
 - c. *Josephine Axt, US Army Corps of Engineers*: The Corps has long-term plans and studies that are looking into how to operate dams and reservoirs in ways that increase water supply and water conservation. The Corps also has watershed planning and environmental infrastructure programs that can be used to advance these efforts.
4. How do you design these programs to include disadvantaged communities? These are great opportunities, but few disadvantaged communities have the requisite grant-writing resources.
 - a. *Director Cowin*: DWR recognizes the need to add funding to build capacity, for example, through an IRWMP set-aside requirement. It may currently be around 10%, and regions could take this into consideration as they develop their plans to ensure the money is available for those purposes.
 - b. *Assistant Administrator Silva*: The State Revolving Fund can go to a 30% set-aside, but right now this is voluntary, not required. You also need the capacity-building for the long-term.
 - c. *Chair Spivy-Weber*: SWRCB did target these communities, but did not have great success. To have more success the Board will have to say prioritize benefits for

- low income areas, and support larger areas including these goals. Capacity-building for individual communities should also be a priority at the agency level.
- d. *Commissioner Connor*: One of the challenges is cost-share requirements. Ideally a municipal entity could subsidize this as part of a larger program.
5. What can local agencies do to raise awareness and get public support?
 - a. *Commissioner Connor*: Education about the benefits is important – including educating the Administration. This is seen in the Recovery Act, and the Bureau is aiming for greater investment next time around (e.g., Title XVI). It took time to recognize these benefits, and these success and benefit stories are important to share so that we have material to use when testifying before Congress.
 - b. *Chair Spivy-Weber*: Recycling has a 75% Federal match to 25% investments; the same thing needs to be done for conservation. Locals need to internalize that investment, and then share their success to get further funding. It would be great for all districts to look at their operation and maintenance budgets, and determine how much they need to be self-sufficient in the future, and then identify what Federal and State assistance they can currently get.
 6. How can we avoid focusing overly on urban concerns, to the loss of agricultural lands?
 - a. *Chief White*: As a community and a society we need to identify the value of agriculture and keeping this as part of our landscapes. USDA has several easement programs, including purchase of development rights.
 - b. *Martha Davis* (panelist): Demonstration projects that showcase integration and coordination will be key to getting further support for this work.
 - c. *Chief White*: NRCS plans to work with the agencies on projects like groundwater recharge, meadow restoration, and things that can be started immediately and demonstrate results. We recognize the importance of partnerships.
 - d. *Commissioner Connor*: We might not have the existing authority to develop a block grant program, but we can identify where our programs overlap or align close and how to strategically address specific topics, and create an *ad hoc* block grant program that lines up with IRWMP efforts. We aim to develop a foundation of a plan in the next two months that identifies how we might work together in maybe five areas, obtain feedback on this, and then move forward on implementation.
 - e. *Assistant Administrator Silva*: Sometime this summer or late summer it would be valuable to have a conference around integrated resources management, including interested State and Federal agencies, to highlight the kind of approaches we are thinking about.
 - f. *Director Cowin*: We've been doing a better job of integrating State agencies, and I am particularly proud of what we did with the California Water Plan this time around. A 21-member State Agency Steering Committee took authorship of the plan, and sat down and identified our responsibilities and authorities and what we can do together. The next step is bringing in Federal agencies, and DWR is willing to try.

6. Adjournment

Pablo Arroyave again thanked all participants for their time and ideas, and the staff that supported the day's activities. He noted that a press release would be available. He anticipated a public meeting sometime this summer that would focus on a draft plan and strategy, and noted that this would be informed by the day's input. He encouraged people to submit comment cards if they felt they had additional ideas to contribute, and to visit the main Roundtable website to see progress, announcements, comments and statements, and presentations.

7. Attendance

	AFFILIATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME
1	Agricultural Water Management Council	Wade	Mike
2	Association of California Water Agencies	Bolland	Dave
3	Bureau of Reclamation	Arroyave	Pablo
4	Bureau of Reclamation	Glaser	Don
5	Bureau of Reclamation	Slavin	Tracy
6	Bureau of Reclamation	Clancy	Kevin
7	Bureau of Reclamation	Connor	Michael
8	Bureau of Reclamation	Denning	Michelle
9	Bureau of Reclamation	Finkler	Kira
10	Bureau of Reclamation	Goggin	Kate
11	Bureau of Reclamation	Johannis	Mary
12	Bureau of Reclamation	Looper	Sheri
13	Bureau of Reclamation	Lucero	Pete
14	Bureau of Reclamation	Maucieri	Mat
15	Bureau of Reclamation	Muehlberg	Craig
16	Bureau of Reclamation	Owens	Winetta
17	Bureau of Reclamation	Sierzputowski	Janet
18	Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region	Steele	Bill
19	CA Association of Winegrape Growers	King	Camron
20	CA Department of Public Health	Lischeske	Carl
21	CA Department of Water Resources	Alemi	Manucher
22	CA Department of Water Resources	Hoffman-Floerke	Dale
23	CA Department of Water Resources	Huff	Gwen
24	CA Department of Water Resources	Reynolds	Dean
25	CA Department of Water Resources	Ballanti	Rachel
26	CA Energy Commission	Beck Jr.	Dennis
27	CA Regional Water Board, Central Valley Region	Longley	Karl
28	CA State Board of Food and Agriculture	Montna	Al
29	CA State Water Resources Control Board	Balgobin	David
30	CA State Water Resources Control Board	Ragazzi	Erin
31	CA State Water Resources Control Board	Howard	Tom
32	CA State Water Resources Control Board	Peters	Laura
33	CA State Water Resources Control Board	Spivy-Weber	Frances
34	Cal Poly Irrigation Training & Research Center	Burt	Charles
35	California Department of Water Resources	Cowin	Mark

36	California Farm Bureau	Merkley	Danny
37	California Urban Water Conservation Council	Brown	Chris
38	California Water Institute	Haddix	Brian
39	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS	Fougères	Dorian
40	Central California Irrigation District, SJRECWA	White	Chris
41	Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	Swanson	Curtis
42	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Schnagl	Rudy
43	City of Modesto	Pinhey	Nick
44	City of Santa Rosa Utilities Department	Carlson	Dan
45	City of Turlock	Madden	Dan
46	Community Alliance with Family Farmers	Runsten	David
47	Conservationist/Consultant	Bonea	Ryan
48	Delta Diablo Sanitation District	Strommer	Jayne
49	Department of Food and Agriculture	Pegos	David
50	Department of the Interior	Nawi	David
51	Dixon Resource Conservation District	Currey	John S.
52	Dublin San Ramon Services District	Requa	Dave
53	Eastern Municipal Water District	Pack	Anthony J.
54	Eastern Municipal Water District	Wright	Bonnie
55	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water	Davis	Debbie
56	Environmental Protection Agency	Foresman	Erin
57	Environmental Protection Agency	Silva	Peter S.
58	Environmental Protection Agency	Schwinn	Karen
59	Friant Water Authority	Jacobsma	Ron
60	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District	Bettner	Thad
61	Inland Empire Utilities Agency	Davis	Martha
62	Irvine Ranch Water District	Sanchez	Fiona
63	Kings River Conservation District	Hoelzel	Rick
64	Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA	Sienkiewich	Andy
65	Meyers Farms Family Trust	Meyers	Marvin
66	National Marine Fisheries Service	McInnis	Rodney
67	Natural Resources Defense Council	Osann	Ed
68	Northern California Water Association	Manley	Todd
69	Office of Congressman George Miller	Hoffman	Kathy
70	Orange County Water District	Markus	Michael
71	Pacific Institute	Cooley	Heather
72	Pacific Institute	Christian-Smith	Juliet
73	Reclamation District 108	Chandler	Kathryn
74	Regional Water Authority	Woodling	John
75	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation Dist	Robles	Ruben
76	San Diego County Water Authority	Roy	Toby
77	San Joaquin Resource Conservation District	Watkins	Molly
78	Santa Anna Watershed Project Authority	Cantu	Celeste
79	South Bay Water Recycling, City of San Jose	Rosenblum	Eric
80	Southern CA Water Replenishment District	Whitaker	Robb
81	State Assembly	Brandt	Alf
82	Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives	Calimlim Touton	Camille

83	The Nature Conservancy	Ingram	Campbell
84	The Nature Conservancy	Tatayon	Susan
85	Tulare Irrigation District	Fukuda	Aaron
86	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Axt	Josephine
87	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Tejeda	Cindy
88	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Toland	Tanis
89	U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS	Apodaca	Robert
90	U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS	DeLorenzi	Jen
91	U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS	White	Dave
92	U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS	Kiger	Luana
93	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Rodriguez	Dara
94	United States Geological Survey	Gaydos	Leonard J.
95	United States Geological Survey	Fuji	Roger
96	WateReuse - California Chapter	Smith	Dave
97	Western Growers Association	Puglia	Dave
98	Yolo Resource Conservation District	Wrysinski	Jeanette